


BV
811
.L363

718



Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Part of the
ADDISON ALEXANDER LIBRARY,
which is deposited by
MESSRS. D. VAN NEST & COMPANY.

BV 811 .L363
Lape, Thomas.
Manual of Christian baptism









A

MANUAL

OF

**CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:
INFANT BAPTISM,**

AND THE

M O D E ;

IN TWO DISCOURSES,

BY THE

Rev. THOMAS LAPE, A. M.

SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED AND ENLARGED.

Baltimore:

PRINTED AT THE PUBLICATION ROOMS
OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH,
NO. 7, SOUTH LIBERTY STREET.

1843.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress of the United States, in the year 1843, by THOMAS LAPE, A. M., in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maryland.

P R E F A C E .



THE former edition was written in the midst of many interruptions, and the result naturally was, the occurrence of some inaccuracies. The present edition has been corrected and considerably enlarged. It has been the object of the writer to present the interesting subjects, which are discussed, in a clear, intelligible, but above all, *scriptural* manner. The work has been written with no unkind feelings towards his Baptist brethren, from whose principles, he dissents. He hopes and prays that the day is not far distant when the unhappy division that now exists on the *subjects* and *mode* of baptism may not only cease, but that christians of every denomination may live together in Peace, Union and Fellowship.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. FROM the Rev. George A. Lintner, D. D., late President of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran church in the United States.

“I was much pleased with your treatise on *baptism* and I have no doubt that in the minds of many of our people it will be instrumental in removing the difficulties and correcting the misrepresentations that have existed on this subject. It is brief and comprehensive, and presents the whole controversy in so simple a form, and clear a light, that all who read, can understand it. I am pleased to hear that you are about publishing another edition, and hope that the work may be extensively circulated through our church.”

2. I take pleasure in stating that I entirely concur in the sentiments respecting the Rev. Mr. Lape's Treatise on Baptism, expressed by the Rev. Dr. Lintner. B. KURTZ.

3. At a recent meeting of the Synod of Hartwick, held in Johnstown, Fulton county, New York, the following is the result of the committee appointed to examine said work:

“The committee appointed to examine the work, *Manual of Baptism*, would respectfully report that the work has been prepared with care and is considered well adapted to establish the minds of our people on the interesting subjects of *Infant Baptism and the Mode*. The rapid sale of the former edition, together with the additional matter introduced and the approbation of several eminent divines of different denominations, strongly recommend the work to the christian public. The committee are happy to learn that the author is about issuing a second edition, and we trust that it will be widely circulated through the bounds of our church.”

JACOB Z. SENDERLING,
DAVID EYSTER,
LEVI STERNBERG.

INFANT BAPTISM.

Matthew xxviii. 19.

“Go ye therefore and teach (make Disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

By virtue of the authority of Christ, his disciples were invested with a high commission. They were directed to go and make disciples of all nations. The whole world was placed in a salvable state. Baptism was ordained to be the medium of the introduction into the visible church of Christ, and every individual, who has an opportunity of receiving it, is in duty bound to become baptized. But an objector says that believers *only* are to be baptized. To which I reply, that the text is not limited to such *only*, but it declares “make disciples of *all nations*.” A question arises here of what is a nation composed? It is composed of men, women and children. Children then are to be baptized. The objector says, but children are not *expressly* mentioned. I reply, neither are men and women expressly mentioned. Must I then refuse to baptize children because I find no express command in so many words that children are to be baptized? Then according to correct reasoning I must not baptize *men*, because men are not expressly mentioned—then I must not baptize

women, because women are not expressly mentioned. Now to follow out this express rule, then *none* are to be baptized. But this is contrary to the text, viz.—“*make disciples of all nations, baptizing,*” &c. Therefore I am authorized to baptize *all* who compose a nation, men, women and *children*. Infant baptism then is commanded in the scriptures.

In the further elucidation of this subject, let me call your attention to the following considerations.

I. THE CHURCH OF GOD IS VIRTUALLY AND ESSENTIALLY ONE AND THE SAME UNDER BOTH DISPENSATIONS. The common definition of the Church of God is, the collective body of the people of God; though divided into different branches and worshipping God according to different external rules, yet all constitute but one society. Now in the church of God, of both dispensations, we find the same great essential identity. Both dispensations have the same divine Head, both have the same precious covenant, both have the same spiritual object in view, both have the same atoning blood; the same sanctifying spirit, and both have the same great promise of heaven and eternal happiness.

To place this subject beyond any reasonable doubt, the Saviour himself declares in Matthew 5th chap. 17th verse, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to *fulfil.*” The Saviour undoubtedly meant to convey the idea

that he had not come to destroy the law of God or even to lessen its requirements, but to carry out its great object and design more completely, more perfectly, and as far as it had respect to the church of God, which was only in its infant and imperfect state, he would render it too *more complete, more perfect*. The apostle Paul also, speaking of the future restoration of the Jews, says in Romans, 11th chap. 23rd and 24th verses, “they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in *again*. For if thou (Gentile) wert cut out of the olive tree, that is wild by nature (heathenism,) and wert grafted contrary to nature, into a good olive tree (the Jewish church;) how much more shall these (Jews,) who are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree (church?)” The good olive tree here must mean the church of God; the natural branches the Jews, who, in consequence of unbelief were cut off; the wild olive tree means the Gentiles, who were grafted into the good olive tree,—the church of God. Now the apostle teaches, that the Jews, in the fulness of time, *shall again be grafted into the good olive tree*,—the church of God. The natural consequence then is, that the church of God that existed under the Old Testament Dispensation must still be standing, or in other words, the church of God under both Dispensations is virtually and essentially one and the same.

But an objector says, "this is not so." To which I reply, what! if the church of God is represented by the figure of a good olive tree, and the Gentiles, the wild olive tree is grafted into the good olive tree, how could those branches of the wild olive tree live if the good olive tree, into which they are grafted, be dead? They, to exist at all, must draw their nourishment from the good olive tree, and if that were dead, they too must die. But if that lives and imparts nourishment, the grafts placed therein, will live also. So then, since the church of God is still standing, out of which, the Jews in consequence of unbelief, were cast for a season, and the Gentiles admitted: but when the restoration of the Jews shall take place, they, viz. the Jews shall be grafted in again. Now how can they be grafted in again if the good olive tree, into which they are to be grafted again *be dead*? Surely if the church of God under both dispensations is not virtually and essentially one and the same, the apostle Paul would do violence to language to say, speaking of the Jews, that they shall be "*grafted again into their own olive tree,*" or in other words, be received again into the church of God from which they had been excluded.

As a confirmation that the church of God under both dispensations is the same, we have the authority of Christ himself. When he was upon earth, he chose twelve apostles. They were members of the church under the

old dispensation. They attended the worship and the ordinances under that dispensation. The very night previous to his being betrayed they partook of the passover, administered to them by his own hands, which was one of the sacraments of that dispensation, and at which time this ordinance was changed, and called the Lord's Supper. Those very men after his ascension to heaven, were his agents in extending his kingdom upon earth. They preached on the day of Pentecost, and admitted 3000 to his church. Now I ask the question, *were they cut off from the church under the Old Dispensation and initiated into the New Dispensation?* No. They belonged to the same identical church as when they became believers in Christ and ate the Passover Supper with him. Is not this a confirmation without the possibility of doubt, that the church of God under both dispensations is virtually and essentially one and the same?

II. I DESIRE TO CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF INFANTS IN THE CHURCH OF GOD UNDER BOTH DISPENSATIONS. *a.* Infants were members of the church of God under the former dispensation. This truth is contained in several passages in the Bible. We read in Genesis the 3rd chapter, that the covenant, which God made with Adam, before he was banished out of Paradise, included *infants*. The covenant, which God made with Noah after the flood, included *infants*. The covenant, which God made with Abraham is equally

comprehensive. In Gen. 17th chap. we have this covenant stated in this emphatic language, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy *seed* after thee in their generations, for an *everlasting covenant*: to be a God unto thee and thy *seed* after thee." Again, God says, "this is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy *seed* after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin: and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you: every man child in your generation: he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he, that is bought with money must needs be circumcised and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an *everlasting covenant*."

Again, in Deuteronomy 29th chapter, the same covenant was promulgated anew by Moses as the covenant made with Abraham: and represented as the basis of that visible people of God, which should profess his name in all future generations: "ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God: your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your *little ones*, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy camp from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into

his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day: that he may establish thee to day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy Fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath: but with him that standeth here with us, this day, before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day." From these passages, "it is evident, says Dr. Dwight, that the covenant made with Abraham was made first with himself: secondly, with his household generally: thirdly, with his servants by name, whether they were born in his house or bought with money: fourthly, with his *infant children*, afterwards limited particularly to the descendants of Jacob: fifthly, to these descendants as a people: sixthly, to their *little ones*, or infants in every generation: seventhly, to the strangers who dwell in their nation. To all these, God covenanted that he would be their God, and that they should be his people."

In accordance with this divine covenant, we have the strongest declarations in the Sacred Scriptures that children had for nearly 2000 years before Christ, been invariably received into the church of God. Not only were the children of Jewish parents thus admitted into the church of God, but the children of those parents when they became proselytes to the Jewish religion, were, likewise, admitted to

the church. And although various alterations had been made in the outward ceremonies of religion, yet nothing had been done to change the nature of the everlasting covenant, which God had made with Abraham. When our Saviour was born into this world, we read that he was taken into the temple of the Lord to do for him after the custom of the Law, and while there, good old Simeon took him into his arms, blessed God and said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." If children had been excluded from the church of God, we would not have had this beautiful illustration of infant dedication. If children had been excluded from the church of God, we would not have had that tender language of our Saviour, "suffer little children to come unto me for *of such* is the kingdom of heaven."* If children had been excluded from the church of God, the Saviour would not have uttered the general and unlimited command contained in the text. "Go ye and *make disciples of all nations,*" &c.

In addition to the above considerations, we are informed in history, that baptism had been introduced among the Jews, in connection with circumcision as an initiatory rite, and was thus applied to *infants*. Sometime before Christ there was a rigid sect among the Jews, called

*If Christ considered children proper subjects for the kingdom of heaven, then certainly they are proper subjects for an admission into his church upon earth.

the Essenes, who had been in the habit of receiving proselytes by *baptism*, both *adults and children*. Maimonides, the great expounder of the Jewish law declares, that "baptism was in the wilderness before the giving of the law." Again he says, "that was a common axiom, no man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and *baptized*." Says Rabbi Hona, "children are baptized by direction of the consistory." Says that eminent historian and divine, Dr. Miller, of Princeton: "We have the most abundant proof that the Jewish Rabbins unanimously declare that, the baptism of proselytes had been practised by the Jews in all ages, even from Moses down to the time when they wrote." A host of other men, the most learned and candid make the same acknowledgment. Epictitus, a heathen philosopher, who lived at the time of the apostles, has the following language in confirmation that baptism was customary among the Jews; "And when we see any one wavering we are wont to say, this is not a Jew, but acts one. But when he assumes the sentiments of one, who has been *baptized and circumcised*, then he both really is, and is called a Jew." The Rev. Mr. Booth, a distinguished Baptist writer, admits that "*the children of proselytes were baptized along with their parents*." Says the learned and pious Dr. Wall, "there never was an age, at least since Abraham, in which the children, whether of Jews or proselytes, that were admitted into covenant, had not some badge or sign of such

their admission. The male children of Abraham's race were entered by circumcision. The whole body of the Jews, men, women and children were in Moses' time baptized. After which the male children of proselytes, that were admitted by circumcision, baptism and a sacrifice, the female children by a baptism and a sacrifice." In a word, we have the most conclusive evidence that children together with adults were baptized before the coming of Christ. And as a further confirmation of this custom, the Jews expected that when the Messiah came, he would baptize: else how can we account why the question was put by the Jews to John the Baptist as recorded by John, 1st chapter, 25th verse, "why baptizest thou then if thou be not that *Christ*?"

In accordance with the above considerations, the language of the text could not have been understood to mean that infants would be excluded from baptism and from the church of God. No. But on the contrary, since children were included in the covenant, which God had made with Abraham, and which too was an everlasting covenant, and since children had been regularly admitted to the church of God during the period of nearly two thousand years; we are authorized to come to the conclusion that, if God intended to have excluded infants from the covenant of promise and from his church, *he would have given a command to that effect in language as explicit as their introduction into his church had been explicit.* But

on the contrary, we find, that instead of such an exclusion from his church, Christ, our Saviour uttered the language of the text, "*Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them,*" &c. in other words, baptize all who make up a nation, men, women, and *children*.

b. From this part of the subject, we pass on to the consideration of the New Testament history, *in which we find the principle of family baptism as clearly stated as in the Old Testament*. And here let it be remembered that all the apostles were native Jews. They had of course, been accustomed to the practice of family baptism and infant membership to the church of God on the faith of the parents. They had never seen or even heard of a sect that attempted to exclude children from the church of God, but on the contrary, they had always seen children, both male and female, universally admitted to membership in the church with their parents, on the faith of the parents. When the apostles therefore speak of family baptism, they consequently must be understood to mean, that children were baptized with their parents. In the Acts of the Apostles, 16th chapter, 15th verse, we have described the family of Lydia, and in the 33rd, the family of the jailor at Philippi. In Corinthians, chapter 1st, 16th verse, the family of Stephanus.

What adds weight to the fact that children were included in those household baptisms is the declaration, which Peter made on the day

of Pentecost, Acts 2nd chapter, 39th verse, "*For the promise is to you and to your children.*" The language of the apostle here is virtually the same as that used in the everlasting covenant made by God to Abraham, 17th chapter, 7th verse, "*To be a God to thee, and unto thy seed after thee.*" Now all must acknowledge that the word *seed* means *children*, and that *children* means *seed*. And as it is evident that parents and infants were intended by the *one*, it must be equally evident that parents and infants are intended by the *other*. Again, remember that the above declaration "*for the promise is to you and to your children,*" was made by Peter to the Jews, at a time when thousands of them had been assembled together at Jerusalem to celebrate one of their great feasts. I say this declaration was made to the Jews, who had always seen children admitted to the church, and consequently since Peter, who had been a Jew himself, and he too addressing Jews, must have meant the promise which God had made to Abraham that "*he would be a God to him and his seed after him in their generations for an everlasting covenant.*" As if he had said "*this promise is not annulled under the new dispensation, but it is extended to you and to your children. You can participate in it, you and your children as well as under the former dispensation, and become saved, through the promised Messiah.*"

Thus then, we have seen that the church of God under the old and the new dispensation

is virtually and essentially one and the same. And we have seen too that infant-membership is a constituent part of both dispensations.

III. From this part of the subject we pass on to consider THE INITIATION OF INFANTS INTO THE CHURCH OF GOD. During the Old Testament dispensation, *circumcision was the initiatory rite*. We are told in Genesis, 17th chap. 10th verse. "This is my covenant, says God, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; *every man-child among you shall be circumcised.*" Here you perceive that circumcision is the initiatory rite into the church of God. It is both a *sign and a seal*; a *sign* of the relation which Abraham sustained to God and a *seal*, a public confirmation to the fact that, God had formerly approved of him and that he should be the father, the illustrious example of the faithful both of the Jews and the Gentiles throughout the world. That circumcision is the sign and seal of the covenant, which God made with Abraham, we have this express declaration of the apostle Paul in Romans, 4th chapter, 11th verse, "he (Abraham) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Here then we have a sign, and a seal of the righteousness of faith. This is the very subject, that the apostle Paul is urging as the ground, by which the sinner is justified and has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: of which justification the apostle cites Abraham as an illus-

trious example? Thus you perceive that Abraham received circumcision as the seal. But the question arises, *what is the import of the seal?* It is the renewal of the heart and of the spirit. This was the true circumision of which the outward circumcision was given as the sign. The apostle Paul says in Romans, 2nd chap. 29th verse, "circumcision is that of the *heart*, in the *spirit*, and not in the letter." THAT, is the real import of the outward sign circumcision.

Now baptism is the seal and sign of the same thing. The apostle in Acts, 22nd chap. 16th verse says, "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Let it be remembered that baptism does not *literally* wash away sins. No, but it is truly the sign or seal of the washing away of sins, and of acceptance with God in justification through the righteousness of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The real washing away of sin is effected only by the blood of Christ, of which baptism is only the seal, in the same manner that circumcision under the old dispensation was the seal of the righteousness of faith: and the blood of Christ is shadowed forth by the application of water in baptism. A question arises here, *what is the import of this seal effected by baptism?* It is the cleansing of the heart from the pollutions of sin by the Holy Spirit, which is called in scripture, the baptism of the spirit, or as it is termed by the apostle, "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Here then you evidently perceive, that as circumcision under the old dispensation was the sign and seal of our acceptance with God, so baptism, under the new, is in like manner the sign and seal of our acceptance with God. Both effect precisely the same thing.

Again, the apostle does not stop here, but he declares *that baptism is the sign of the circumcision of the heart*, or in other words, it is *christian circumcision*. He says in Collossians 2nd chapter, 11th and 12th verses, "in whom (Christ) ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh: by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism." *What is a circumcision made without hands?* It is the regeneration of the heart as declared by God himself in Deuteronomy, 30th chapter, 6th verse. "The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Again, *what is this circumcision of Christ?* It cannot mean his circumcision in the flesh, when eight days old. Neither can it be the circumcision of the heart, for this is expressed above as the circumcision made without hands, but it is our being "buried with him in baptism." Thus it is evident that christian circumcision is New Testament baptism. And baptism is christian circumcision. Hence baptism takes the place of circumcision. In a word, baptism answers the same thing as circumcision. It is

the seal of the same everlasting covenant. It is ordained for the same church. It answers precisely the same object, viz.—the cleansing of the heart by the Holy Spirit.

As an evidence of which we have *the example of Christ, the Great Head of the church himself*. When he commissioned his apostles to go and make disciples, &c., they belonged to the church under the old dispensation, they had not received christian baptism by the use of water, in any mode, but had only been circumcised, and in virtue of their circumcision and faith in Christ, they by Christ were made the pillars of the church under the new dispensation. Now if circumcision was not a spiritual ordinance and an initiation into the church of God, why were they not baptized before *celebrating the christian passover with Christ* and receiving the great commission in the text, to be the means of extending his kingdom throughout the world?

The question arises, why then were they, who had been circumcised, not acknowledged members of the church, at the day of Pentecost? *Why were they baptized?* I answer, because that circumcision, had been abolished and baptism instituted; and because they had not believed in Christ, until after the introduction of the new dispensation by the apostles, they therefore were required to be initiated into that dispensation by the ordinance of baptism—the initiatory rite.

a. But notwithstanding this scriptural representation of the substitution of baptism instead of circumcision, yet an objection is raised, "*This is not so, baptism is a spiritual ordinance, but circumcision is not.*" I admit that in the covenant of God with Abraham, there were national blessings stated, but at the same time, we have the positive declarations of God himself that spiritual blessings of the highest degree were therein contained. God covenanted with Abraham in the following explicit language, "to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." And again in a ratification of this same covenant in Deut. 29th chapter, Moses expressly declares, "*That he (God) may establish thee to day for a people unto himself and that he may be unto thee a God.*" Declarations thus solemnly made by God himself cannot be understood in any other light than meaning spiritual blessings. If they do not mean spiritual blessings, *what else can they mean?* Do we read in any part of the Bible, that God ever promised, any people, that he would be their God in a political point of view? No. There is no instance to be found. But we have many declarations, that he in a spiritual point of view, is a God to protect and defend,—to bless and to save his people. Look for example in Rev. 21st chapter, 7th verse, where he says, "*He that overcometh shall inherit all things and I will be his God and he shall be my son.*" Evidently here the highest spiritual blessing is implied. In a similar point

of view, the declarations, in the covenant, which God made with Abraham must be understood to imply spiritual blessings and that too of the highest degree.

Again, if baptism has not come in the place of circumcision, *then a highly spiritual blessing has been annulled.* Under the Old Testament dispensation there were two sacraments, Circumcision and the Passover. The Lord's Supper has taken the place of the passover, and if baptism does not take the place of circumcision, then the church of God, under the new dispensation, has been deprived of a sacrament, which has been declared by the apostle Paul to be of peculiar advantage. The question was asked, what advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there of circumcision? The apostle in Rom. 3rd chapter, 1st verse replies, "*much every way, chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God,*" that is, the scripture of the Old Testament, especially the law of Moses and those types, promises and prophecies which relate to Christ and the gospel. Now if baptism does not take the place of circumcision, then that sacrament, which God had ordained for the introduction of infants into the church of God, has been lost. Does then no sacrament, ordained to be the seal of the everlasting covenant to infants, succeed it? Is then the New Testament church, in all her fulness—perfection and unlimited extension, less gracious to infants than the old, which embraced them and which had a sacra-

ment ordained, for their admission and participation in all her spiritual blessings? No! who can for a moment, indulge the thought? must we not hence conclude that baptism by the authority of our Lord himself, has taken the place of circumcision; that these baptized, have the same spiritual blessings in the New Testament church, as those, that were circumcised under the old dispensation, enjoyed?

b. Another objection raised, is, *but circumcision was applied to males only?* Admit it, but females nevertheless participated, under the Old Testament dispensation, in all the *spiritual blessings of the everlasting covenant.* They not only were included, but were virtually circumcised in the males. Paul says in 1 Cor. 11th chap. 3rd verse, that the "head of the woman is the man." What, therefore, was done to the head was done to the body, or in other words, what was done to the man, was virtually done to the woman. At the commencement of the new dispensation, an initiatory rite was established for admission into the church, which could be applied to both sexes. It was baptism. In view of which the apostle Paul in Gal. 3rd chap. 28th verse, says "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither *male nor female.*" Thus you perceive that the distinction which once existed between male and female is not only abolished, but the distinction likewise between Jew and Greek, bond and free. The blessings of christianity are now extended to

all without regard to nation and condition, to young and to old, whether male or female. Or as the commission of Christ is in the text "*Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing,*" &c.

c. Another objection raised against infant baptism is, but Christ declares, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" *How then can children be proper subjects for baptism, seeing that they cannot believe?* To which I reply, let us read the whole of that passage. It is recorded in Mark, chap. 16th, verse 16th. "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.*" Thus then you perceive that by taking the latter part of the sentence in connection with the former, if believing is necessary in a subject for baptism, then believing is equally necessary for salvation, and the legitimate conclusion is that, because children cannot believe, therefore children cannot be saved. Or to place this kind of reasoning in the form of a syllogism. The objector's argument stands as follows :

Faith is required in order to baptism.

But infants cannot exercise faith.

Therefore, infants cannot be baptized.

We will follow out this same kind of reasoning, based on the latter part of the verse :

Faith is required in order to salvation.

But infants cannot exercise faith.

Therefore, infants cannot be saved.

Thus then the objection not only excludes infants from the church of God, but consigns them to everlasting woe and destruction. Awful conclusion!! What christian parent's heart does not recoil at the very idea?

If this passage of scripture is produced to oppose infant baptism, then it militates against the text. "*Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing,*" &c. where infants are evidently included. No, brethren, not only has this passage of scripture no reference to infants, but likewise all similar passages which require spiritual acts to a proper reception of the ordinance of baptism: such as, "Repent and be baptized—Believe and be baptized," &c. All such exhortations are addressed only to *adults*. And when we are called upon to instruct adult persons, who have never been baptized, we always address them in the above scriptural language. They have no reference whatever to infants. As such they are understood, generally, by the most learned and pious men.

Again, we are often told that *faith* should precede baptism as in the above passage; "*He that believeth and is baptized.*" True *believing* is here put before baptism, but then let it not be forgotten that the reverse too is the case. Christ says in John, 3rd chapter, 5th verse, "Except a man be born of *water* and of the spirit," &c. John says in Matthew, 3rd chapter, 11th verse, "I indeed baptize with *water*—he, viz., Christ shall baptize you with

the Holy Ghost." Here baptism is placed before regeneration—the very thing which it imparts. The objectors arguments based upon the order of language is therefore not only against him, but it is more in favour of putting *baptism before believing* than after it.

d. Another objection raised against infant baptism, is "*what benefit can it be to baptize unconscious babes?*" I would answer this question by asking another. What benefit was it to those children, Mark 10th chapter, 16th verse, which our Saviour, when upon earth, took into his arms and *blessed*? Could they understand the import of that *blessing*? They could certainly understand the ordinance of baptism as well as they could the blessing of Christ pronounced upon them? Let it here be remarked that laying on of hands was an ancient and a venerable custom. The apostle Paul in Heb. 6th chap. 2nd verse, ranks it with baptisms, the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment. What that peculiar blessing consisted in, which our Saviour pronounced upon those unconscious children, we are not informed, but it must have been no ordinary blessing. And what is baptism but a dedication to God so that his blessing should rest upon them? Intimately connected with this subject, is their capability of complying with the obligations of their baptism. Brethren, baptism imposes no new obligation, which we are not previously bound to obey. It is only an acknowledgment of that obligation, or in

other words, it is the answer of a good conscience towards God and man. And children under the new dispensation, are under no greater obligations to obey the laws of God *now*, than children were under the former dispensation. Paul says expressly, "I testify unto every man, that is circumcised, is a *debtor* to the whole law." Why I ask are not children *now* as capable of the baptismal obligations to the laws of Christ as the circumcised children of the Jews were of being debtors to the laws of Moses? Certainly just as capable.

Again, another answer to the above objection is, *because it is God's commands*. The point at issue is not between the objector and myself, but between himself and the God of heaven. He has, in the most explicit manner, declared that every male child of the Jewish people should be circumcised on the eighth day for an *everlasting covenant*. And since that everlasting covenant has not been annulled, but is still in force, although the rite for admission into the church has only been changed, and is extended to both sexes, it is therefore the duty—the *bounden duty* of every christian parent to have his children solemnly dedicated to God by baptism. He has no more right to withhold his children from this ordinance, than a Jewish parent had his son from being circumcised. What did the wise man mean when he said, "*Train up a child* in the way that he should go," &c., but that it directly implied, a *dedication* of him to God? What did the apos-

tle Paul in Eph. 6th chapter, 4th verse, mean when he said “and ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but *bring them up* in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,” but that it directly implied a *dedication* to God?

But a question arises here, “*if then the one of the parents be a christian and the other not, ought their children to be baptized?*” To which I answer, that a similar question was put to the apostle Paul, as recorded in 1 Cor. 7th chap. 14th verse. The following is his answer, “the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife: and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, *but now are they holy.*” But how are they *holy*? In being separated from the rest of the world and dedicated to God. Holiness, in scripture, is used in a two-fold sense. In one sense, it means purity of heart and life; in the other, separated from common use and dedicated to God. And as persons, places, &c. must be dedicated to God, in order to their being *accounted holy*, so children must be dedicated to God, in order that they may be *thus rendered holy*.

But an objection is raised, “if children are thus accounted holy by virtue of the faith of one of the parents, *why then will not the unbelieving parent be accounted equally holy?*” To which I reply, if the apostle had *so* understood it, he would evidently have declared it, but since he has *not* said so, we are not to infer that the unbelieving parent is thus accounted

holy. His reasoning has reference only to *children*, who are accounted holy *alone* by virtue of the faith of one of their parents.

Another question arises here, “*if children are members of the church of Christ, in view of their baptism, why then are they prevented from coming to the table of the Lord?*” To which I reply, in the old dispensation, children were members of the church of God, but they however were not permitted to partake of the Passover until they had arrived at a proper age, so as to understand its object and design—assume the obligations required and the engagements of the everlasting covenant. So, under the new dispensation, baptized children, although they are members of the church of Christ, but yet are not permitted to participate in its spiritual privileges, until they too arrive at a proper age—have the proper instruction—can examine their own hearts and are able to discern the Lord’s body, then and not till then are they received into full communion in the church and are entitled to all the spiritual privileges of said church.

Again, another question arises, “*was not the Lord’s Supper administered in former ages to children?*” I admit it, but those who did thus administer it to them had no scriptural warrant for so doing. In like manner, we are informed that those who were immersed, in former ages, were thus immersed *entirely naked*, whether they were men, *women or children*. If the one was improper so was the other. If the

one was unwarranted by the sacred scriptures so was the other. We will therefore place both in the same scale and say that the people in those days had superstitious notions in relation to the ordinances of God.

e. Another objection is urged, "*that there is no instance on record in the New Testament of infant baptism.*" To which I reply, that in all the examples of household baptisms in the New Testament, there is no mention made that there were any *adults*. The objector cannot deny that Lydia and Stephanus, Cornelius and the jailor were the only *believing members* of their respective families. It is said expressly of Lydia, that the Lord opened the heart of Lydia. Not a word is said that any of her household had either repented or had exercised faith besides *herself*. But yet we are told that her household was baptized. Here then it is manifest, that whether her family consisted of adults or children, they were baptized on the faith of the *parent or heads of the household*. Now if the objector denies that there were any children in these household baptisms, then he must admit that those adults were baptized without manifesting either repentance or faith; which principle is directly opposed to his "*believer's baptism.*" He no doubt would sooner acknowledge that they were children. This is the only rational conclusion to which we can arrive. These households therefore consisted of children, who were thus baptized on the faith of *the parents alone*.

Again, as a confirmation of the above conclusion, we are informed that there is a Syriac version of the Bible, whose date is assigned to the first century, which has the word "*household*" translated "*children*." "Lydia was baptized and *her children*." "The jailor and *his children*," &c.

The above examples are the offering up of their respective families to the Lord. They are just such accounts as would now be given of a household or family that were baptized on the faith of their parents.

But there is a striking example of infant baptism recorded in the New Testament which cannot be successfully contradicted. In 1 Cor. 10th chapter, we are told "that *all* our fathers were under the cloud and *all* passed through the sea: and were *all* baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Now if the baptism of the fathers was valid, then that of the children who accompanied them was equally valid with that of the fathers. Who will deny this?

As an evidence that there were children who actually accompanied their parents through the Red Sea, we have the fact stated, preceding that eventful period in Ex. 12th chapter, 37th verse, "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides *children*." Subsequently, an allusion to them is made in Deut. 1st chap. 39th verse, in the following language, "Moreover your *little ones*,

which ye said should be a prey, and *your children which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil*, they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it." With the exception of Caleb and Joshua all the (then) fathers, who left Egypt, died in the wilderness, but their children had grown up—they become fathers—they together with Caleb and Joshua took possession of the land of Canaan—they constituted the principal part of the Israelitish community and of the church of God from that time.* Nay, in the language of Moses, Deut. 5th chapter, 3rd verse, "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even us who are all of us here alive this day.*" Here then we see that those who were little ones and children, *who in that day had no knowledge between good and evil*, constituted a part of the fathers spoken of by the apostle in the above chapter. They, *in their infancy were baptized unto Moses and in the cloud, and thus their baptism presents us with a striking example of infant baptism in the New Testament.*

But again, in connection with God's providential dealings with the Israelites in consequence of their sins, the apostle, in the above chapter adds another idea, which is contained in the 6th verse, but particularly in the 11th verse, in the following language: "Now all these things happened unto them for *ensamples*

*Exodus 10th chapter, 9, 10, 11 and 24th verses. Num. 14th chap. 28—31 verses.

i. e. types, patterns. And since infant baptism constituted one of these things alluded to by the apostle as a type or pattern of the New Dispensation, therefore we have here a striking example of infant baptism recorded in the New Testament, and such a one that we may safely and lawfully follow. “Moreover, brethren, says the apostle, I would not that ye should be *ignorant how that our fathers were baptized,*” &c., as if his object was to impress upon their minds, that they *had been dedicated to God by their baptism*, and were thus placed under peculiar obligations to serve the Lord, their God.

f. Another objection gravely urged against infant baptism is, “*that children ought not to be baptized, because Jesus Christ himself was not baptized before he was thirty years of age?*” This objection implies too much. If we are strictly to follow out the example of Christ, then no one can be baptized, however pious and devoted, until he too has arrived to the age of thirty. To this, the objector would not willingly consent, yet it is in strict accordance with his own principles of reasoning.

Again, let it be remarked that the baptism by John was not a christian baptism. To convince you on this subject, I will refer you to the mode of christian baptism in the next discourse.

But the question returns, “*why then was Jesus Christ baptized by John?*” I answer, he represented the High Priest, and was to be the High Priest over the house of God. His bap-

tism was his introduction into that sacred office. "The Mosaic law required every priest when thirty years of age (Num. 43rd chapter, 23rd, 30th and 35th verses,) to be consecrated to their sacred work by being sprinkled and washed with water (Lev. 8th chap. 6th verse,) as a symbol of the anointing of the Holy Ghost, they were also anointed with oil. Now mark the coincidence. When Jesus came to John, he was about thirty years old (Luke 3rd chap. 21st and 23rd verses,) and was just about entering upon his office as Priest: after baptism he was anointed by the descent of the Holy Ghost."* We read in Luke, 4th chap., that he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and read the following to show his fulfilment in himself; "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has *anointed me* (echrise. "This term, says the learned Dr. Bloomfield, signifies not so much being *anointed*, as *inaugurated*, *introduced* into an office,) to preach the gospel to the poor," &c. Here then you see that immediately after his introduction into the High Priest's office, he entered publicly upon the discharge of the duties of that office. And here you see too that his baptism was his introduction into that office: for the apostle Paul says in Heb. 5th chapter, 5th verse, that Christ did not glorify himself to be made a *High Priest*: but he that said unto him, "Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee." This passage of scripture de-

*Rev. Messrs Cooke and Towne.

clares explicitly that *God made Christ a High Priest*, when he uttered the words, "*Thou art my Son,*" &c. Now this was the same language that God used, (Luke 3rd chap. 22nd verse,) at his baptism.

Again, to comply with the former dispensation, Christ had been circumcised, and now when about to introduce the new dispensation, it was necessary for him to observe the rite in his own person, which was established as the initiation into this new dispensation. Hence he was baptized by John who was the last prophet under the law and who too was declared to be the forerunner of Christ. And although he was thus baptized by John, yet christian baptism was not established until three years afterwards, viz. not until Christ himself gave the apostles the commission contained in the text, "Go ye," &c.

g. Another objection urged with great confidence is, "*where is the express command in the Bible that infants shall be baptized?*" To which I reply, where is the express command that children *shall not be baptized?* We have already shown that infants have, during a space of nearly two thousand years before Christ, been admitted members of the church of God, by an express command of God himself and that too, in accordance with his covenant which is *everlasting*, and before they can be excluded from the church *now*, whose blessings and privileges are in every respect more extensive, there certainly must be an express command

to that effect. We have a right to ask this question of the opposers of infant baptism. In what chapter and verse, in the New Testament, is that prohibition to be found? What! exclude infants from the church of God, to which they have an unalienable right guaranteed them by the great Head of the church; which right has been confirmed by Him, in the commission, which he gave his apostles, as contained in the words of the text. "*Go ye and make disciples of all nations baptizing,*" &c.

Again, if the objection against infant baptism is still urged, because we, in the New Testament, have no express command in so many words to baptize them, and therefore they ought not to be baptized: then by parity of reasoning, the objector, to be consistent with himself, ought not allow females to come to the table of the Lord, because there is not, in so many words, an express command to that effect—then he ought likewise to reject the christian Sabbath for the same reason. If you ask the objector why he admits females to the communion, he will not pretend to act in accordance with an express command in that respect, but he will proceed to prove their right by inference that they have immortal souls—that they can exercise faith, &c., and therefore they ought to commune. Here you perceive the objector excludes infants from the ordinance of baptism, because he does not in so many words find an express command in

the New Testament to that effect, but notwithstanding this, he will admit females to the communion without such an express command!! Is this manner of reasoning correct and conclusive? Is it honest and sincere? No, brethren, no. We have the authority and the sanction of Christ himself in favor of infant baptism, and therefore let us esteem it a privilege that we and our children can be united to the same church and participate in the same covenanted blessings. Let us consecrate them to our God and adopt the language of the christian poet :

“ We bring them, Lord, with thankful hearts,
 And yield them up to thee;
 Joyful that we ourselves are thine,
 Thine may our offspring be.”

From this part of the subject we pass on to consider in the third place, *the historical accounts of infant baptism*. Some of the opponents of infant baptism have gravely declared that it is of recent origin. Others declare that it is the origin of popery. Others again say that it commenced in the second century. Passing by these conflicting representations, by the opponents of infant baptism respecting the time of its commencement, we have, after leaving the scriptural accounts, the most abundant and conclusive evidence in history of its continuation from the time of the apostles. Dr. Miller, of Princeton, who is decidedly one of the most caudid and learned historians of

our country, speaks in the following energetic language on this subject. "I can assure you, my friends, with the utmost candor and confidence, after much careful inquiry on the subject, that for more than fifteen hundred years after the birth of Christ, there was not a single society of professing christians on earth, who opposed infant baptism on any thing like the grounds which distinguish our modern baptist brethren." Similar declarations have been made by a host of other men; men learned, candid and pious; men who have no other object in view but the truth, on this interesting subject, have given us their most decided testimony in the belief of the practice of infant baptism, not only during the apostolic age, but its continuance from that time to the present.

Let it be remarked, that the apostles, Paul and Peter lived till about the year sixty-six in the first century, and that the apostle John lived till about the year 101.

a. Justin Martyr, who is spoken of in the highest terms for truth, was born about the year 100. He says in his writings, "There are many among us of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made disciples of Christ from their childhood." This is an explicit testimony of the baptism of infants, even before the death of the apostle John.

b. Irenæus, a very pious and discreet man, wrote about fifty or sixty years after the apostolic age, says, "Christ came to save all per-

sons who by him are born again (baptized) unto God, *infants and little ones and children.*" This declaration of Irenæus gives full proof that infant baptism was the prevailing practice of the church in his time.

c. Tertullian lived about one hundred years after the apostolic age, acknowledges the common practice of infant baptism in his day, but desired that it might be delayed not only to infants, but even to unmarried persons, in consequence of attributing a mysterious sacredness to baptism. Though when a child was about to die, he declared that it ought to be baptized. If it be right to have a child that is about to die baptized, why not then with the same propriety, baptize those that are *well*?

d. Origen, who is represented as the most learned man of his time, and who had travelled extensively in various countries, was born about one hundred and eighty-five years after the apostolic age. His testimony on infant baptism is clear and direct. He says, "According to the *usage* of the church, baptism is given even to infants." Again he says, "The church received an order from the apostles, to give baptism even to infants."

e. In the year 153, after the apostolic age, a council of sixty-six bishops were assembled at Carthage on a question proposed, whether baptism should be administered to children the second day after their birth, or whether, as in the case of circumcision, it should be delayed till they were eight days old. They unani-

mously agreed to have them baptized as soon as convenient. Here is testimony beyond the possibility of any doubt in the bosom of every rational man, that infant baptism was then universally practised in the churches.

f. I pass by the testimony of several other eminent men, who give the most satisfactory accounts of the practice of infant baptism in the church of Christ. But I will come down to the time of Augustine, the great luminary of the age. He lived about two hundred and eighty-eight years after the apostles. He says in the most express language, that “the whole church, practice infant baptism.” Again he speaks “of baptizing infants by the authority of the whole church,” which was undoubtedly delivered by our Lord and his apostles.

Pelagius lived at the same time with Augustine. He was a heretic. He however, bears ample testimony in favor of infant baptism. He says in one place, “Men slander me, as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants.” Again he says, “I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants.”

Many more writers might be mentioned, who in the most unequivocal language, declare that infant baptism was practised from the time of the apostles.

g. There is not the least evidence, that infant baptism has ever been considered an innovation, or was ever opposed by any society or

set of men, until the year 1150, when a small party arose among the Waldenses, who opposed it. They believed that infants were incapable of salvation. They however, soon gave up either their opposition, or became extinct. About the time of the Reformation by Luther, in Germany, in the year 1522, there arose a sect, who opposed infant baptism. They were called Anabaptists. And although they spread in several kingdoms of Europe, yet within sixty years past, thousands of them have given up their opposition to infant baptism, and are uniting with Evangelical churches.

h. According to the history of the English Baptists by Ivimey, a distinguished writer of that denomination, the Particular or Calvinistic Baptist denomination, commenced Sept. 12th, 1633. They constitute a respectable body of christians, both as to piety, talent and number of members. In America, they have the second largest number of members of any of the christian denominations. *They* oppose infant baptism.

Thus then, I have given you a faithful sketch of the history of infant baptism from the time of the apostles to the present period, together with a specification of the times, when opposition to it was made.

i. Before however, concluding my remarks on the historical part of infant baptism, let another subject not be overlooked. The church of the Reformation, commonly called

the Protestant church,* embraces *now* rising of sixty millions of members, that portion who oppose infant baptism number about one million.† Now among the number of professors, who constitute the remaining, and who advocate infant baptism, are men of the most extensive learning; men of the deepest piety; men of the greatest humility; men actuated by the purest of motives; men whose object is the glory of God, and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. Now is it reasonable to conclude that men of such character and of such deep piety; men who enjoy all the opportunities of knowledge, human and divine, would advocate infant baptism if they had no scriptural foundation? And what adds weight to this subject is, that all the great Reformers, commencing with Luther, together with all the most learned and pious men, from that time to the present, with few exceptions, should advocate and practise infant baptism, if they had no scriptural warrant for so doing! I appeal to the conscience of every rational being.

j. Again, the Greek church contains about forty-five millions of members. To that church

*Viz. the Lutheran church—the Episcopal—Presbyterian, Baptist, &c.

†The Baptists according to their own published documents number in the United States about 700,000 members. In the United Kingdoms of Great Britain 210,000. Besides these, they have some in other parts of Europe and the Canadas. Among their foreign missionary stations 4,000. All united will not exceed 1,000,000 of members throughout the christian world.

the opponents of infant baptism appeal, supposing that it possesseth the most intimate knowledge of the Greek language, particularly in reference to the definition of the word baptizo, translated baptize. That church advocates and practices infant baptism.

k. Again, the Roman Catholic church has from her very origin, advocated and practised infant baptism, and still does, though she is corrupt in many of her other doctrines. That church contains about one hundred and fifty-five millions of members.

l. Admitting that the two latter may be called christian, let us sum up all these together. The Protestant church contains about sixty millions. The Greek church about forty-five millions, and the Roman Catholic church about one hundred and fifty-five millions; the total amount is about two hundred and sixty millions. Out of this great number, only about one million oppose infant baptism; or, in other words, there is one opposer to infant baptism to two hundred and fifty-nine who advocate and practise it, in the christian church throughout the world. Truly, the contrast is very great, and the result strongly confirms the doctrine of infant baptism.

In view of this subject, who will refuse the dedication of children to God, in baptism? Who will withhold from them the seal of the covenant of promise, which God has ordained for their spiritual good? What christian parent's heart will not be raised in thanksgiving to

Almighty God for his favors manifested to him and his child? Let him dedicate that child to God in baptism—let him bear in mind that they both belong to Christ the great covenanted head of the church—let him discharge his duty to him, looking forward to the time when they shall meet around the throne of God and be re-united forever in heaven!

MODE OF BAPTISM.

Matthew xxviii. 19.

“Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing them* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

CHRISTIAN baptism is not a saving ordinance. It is the symbol of regeneration. It is performed by the use of water. Water has been wisely selected by the Saviour, in consequence of its abundance everywhere, and its adaptation to express the signification of this ordinance.

But the question arises, in what mode is the water to be used in order to constitute it scriptural baptism? There is a difference of opinion on this subject. Our respected Baptist Brethren maintain that *immersion alone* constitutes true baptism. On the other hand, the great body of professing christians, though divided into different denominations, yet they do consider it immaterial, how the water is used whether the subject is immersed into the water, or the water applied in some other way, such as pouring or sprinkling. They maintain with Luther, that “it is not the water that produces the effects, but the word of God, which is connected with the water, for without the word of God, the water is mere water, and does not constitute a baptism; but with the word, it

becomes a baptism, that is to say, a graceful water of life, and the laver of regeneration in the Holy Ghost." Thus you perceive that the question is not whether baptism by immersion is valid baptism; this is admitted by all, but it is whether *immersion alone* constitutes christian baptism? The great body of the christian church maintain that it is not essential in what *mode* water is used, whether by immersion or by pouring or sprinkling.

In the further consideration of this subject, let me call your attention to the meaning of the word, which is employed to express this sacramental rite. It is a Greek word, baptizo, which is derived from bapto. The common definition of which is *to immerse, to wash, to sprinkle, to pour on water and to color us with a liquid.* Satisfactory evidences of these definitions can be given in classical authors to every unbiased mind on this subject. And when we pass from classical authors to the sacred scriptures, we come to the same conclusion. Says Carson, one of the best scholars in the Baptist church, "I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in that opinion," viz. that baptizo signifies to immerse only. This is a declaration not unworthy of your notice. Here, you perceive, is one man's opinion placed in opposition to a host of men, whose qualifications, certainly, are as good as his, and who too, possessing this advantage, that they have no sectarian

principles at stake, have given us their candid opinion to the above definitions. Says Dr. Miller, of Princeton, one of the best scholars and divines of the present age: "I can assure you, that the word which we render baptizo, does legitimately signify the application of water in any way as well as by immersion." "Nay," he continues, "I can assure you, if the most mature and competent Greek scholars that ever lived, may be allowed to decide in this case, that many examples of the use of this word occur in scripture, in which it not only *may*, but manifestly must signify sprinkling, perfusion, or washing in any way."

Luther, in his translation of the Bible, gives it the same definition. It is therein translated *tauffen*. If he designed to have given the word baptizo the definition, *to immerse only*, he would not have employed the word *tauffen* but *eintauchen*. Abundant proof of the above definition can be given from his own works.

Here I would make the remark that our Baptist Brethren not only do great injustice, but they even manifest a want of candor, when they quote the writings of men differing from them on the meaning of the word baptizo. They say for example that Luther, Stuart and other distinguished men acknowledge that that word signifies to immerse, but no one of them gives this as the only definition, but they give other definitions, besides they invari-

ably, when they do baptize, use water in other modes.*

Again, our Baptist Brethren place great confidence in the Greek church as being the best qualified to define the meaning of the word baptizo. But on an examination of their dictionaries in their own native language, it has been found, especially in that one by Gases, which is in common use by the Greeks, that the following definitions of baptizo are given, "*to wet, moisten, bedew; to wash, to bathe, to draw, to pump water.*" The definition to immerse is not given at all, except it be by inference. But notwithstanding this, the Greek church baptize by immersion, extraordinary cases excepted. Children and persons in delicate health are baptized by pouring or sprinkling. Passing by other authorities, let me only mention the name of the Rev. Dr. Kurtz, the able editor of the Lutheran Observer, who, several years ago, travelling in Europe, says:

*To give a specimen how our Baptist brethren oftentimes misrepresent the views of Pædobaptist writers, we will select their manner of quoting Prof. Stuart. They represent him as saying, that the Greek words "*bapto and baptizo mean to dip, plunge or immerse into any thing liquid. All lexicographers are agreed in this.*" Thus far they quote him. But let it be remembered he does not say that these are the *only* meanings of these Greek words. No. He proceeds to show that they and especially baptizo means also "*to wash—to bedew or moisten; which, he says, are more clearly and fully exhibited.*" Our Baptist brethren quote just so much from him as suits their case, and then publish to the world that Prof. Stuart coincides with them in the meaning of those Greek words. Is not this exceedingly unjust and uncandid??

“ We ourselves once witnessed the baptism of an infant in the great cathedral of St. Petersburg by *pouring*.” Such is the history which we have of this church as it respects the definition of the word baptizo and their practice of the mode of baptism.

Without entering farther into detail in relation to the meaning of that word, as it is understood by the christian church in general, I hasten to an examination of some of those passages in the sacred scriptures, where this word occurs, which will fully illustrate and confirm the position laid down that it has other meanings than immersion.

In the classic Greek of the Old Testament, we have several striking instances.

a. In Ecclesiasticus, 34th chap. 25th verse, the son of Sirach, speaking of one who had been purified from the pollution of a dead body says: “ he was baptized from the pollution of the dead.” The question arises how was an individual purified from the pollution of the dead? In the book of Numbers, the 19th chap. 13th verse, we read as follows: “ Who-soever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* (baptized) *upon him*, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him.” Here, you perceive, this baptism was expressly performed by *sprinkling water upon him*. Evidently, here, baptizo cannot mean to immerse, but to sprinkle.

b. In Leviticus, 14th chapter, 6th verse, we have the following language: "As for the living bird, he (the priest) shall take it, and the cedar-wood and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall *dip* (baptize) them and the living bird in the bird that was killed over the running water." Now I appeal to the conscience of any man, is it possible that the cedar-wood, the scarlet, the hyssop and the living bird could all be immersed in the blood of a single bird? There would only be blood sufficient to stain them, or in common language, to render them bloody. Here then the word baptizo cannot mean to immerse, but only to stain or colour.

c. In the book of Dan. 4th chap. 33rd verse, we have a description of the insane king of Babylon given, that he was baptized with the dew of heaven, in the following language: "And his body was *wet* (baptized) with the dew of heaven." Here there can be no immersion. Immersion signifies the sinking of a body in water, but here you perceive that the dew of heaven *fell* upon him. The word baptizo here evidently then cannot mean to immerse, but to *bedew* or *sprinkle*.

Many more instances from the Greek of the Old Testament might be quoted to confirm my position, but I pass on to the New Testament. And here let it be impressed on the mind, there is not a single passage in the Bible, that declares in so many words, that a person WAS EVER BAPTIZED IN WATER, BUT WITH WATER.

In Matthew, 3rd chapter, 16th verse, it is said that John “baptized *with water*.” In John, 1st chap. 31st verse, it is expressed: “Therefore am I come baptizing *with water*.” In Acts 1st chap. 5th verse, it is said: “For John truly baptized *with water*, but ye shall be *baptized with the Holy Ghost*, not many days hence.” Here evidently the water was applied to the person, and not the person to the water. To evade this, however, it is contended by our Baptist Brethren that the particle *with* should be rendered *into*. Admitting for a moment that construction, it should not be forgotten that *into* is not *under*. Immersion does not simply signify *into water*, but particularly *under water*. Again the impropriety of rendering *with* even *into* is evident, when we take the latter part of the sentence in connection with the former. In that case the baptism of the Holy Spirit would be performed by the person sinking into it, but this is contrary not only to good sense, but even to the common language of scripture. The Holy Spirit is every where represented as coming from above—as being poured upon. In Luke, 24th chapter, 49th verse, the Holy Spirit is described; *sent down*. Acts, 2nd chap. 33rd verse, *shed forth*. Acts, 2nd chapter, 2nd verse, *came*. Acts, 8th chap. 16th verse, *fallen*. Acts, 15th chap. 8th verse, *giving*. Acts, 10th chap. 44th verse, *fell*. John, 1st chap. 32nd verse, *descending*. All these passages clearly show that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was an application of it to the person thus baptized.

Again, there is another important idea contained in the above passage (Acts, 1st chapter, 5th verse,) which is that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is analogous to the baptism of water. The apostle Peter, in Acts, 11th chap. 15th and 16th verses, in vindication of his own cause says: "As I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them (epipipto, to fall upon) *as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I* the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized you with water, *but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence.*" Here evidently is not only an allusion to but a fulfilment of the promise of John in the above chapter of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The direct conclusion to which we come is, that since the baptism of the Holy Spirit was effected not by immersion, but by *pouring*, the baptism of water by John was likewise effected not by immersion, but by *pouring or sprinkling*. Who will contradict this?

d. In the 1st Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, 10th chap. 1st and 2nd verses, we have a description given of the Israelites, who were baptized in the cloud, in the following language, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea: and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The question arises how was this baptism performed? Certainly not by immersion, for we are expressly told by Moses in Ex. 14th chap. 22nd verse, that the

children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon *the dry ground*. From this it is evident, that in whatever manner water was used for their baptism, it could not have been by immersion. Does it not appear more reasonable to suppose that if water touched them, at all, it must have been either by the spray of the sea, which the east wind, spoken of by Moses, must have dashed over them? or it might have been performed by the descent of the rain from the clouds which passed over them at the time. For if they were under the cloud, then the cloud was over them, and if they were baptized in the cloud, then they must have received some of its contents upon them. The Psalmist evidently alludes to this in the 9th verse of the 68th Psalm: "Thou, O God, didst send a *plentiful rain*," &c.

It may be said that the language of the apostle is figurative, and thereby implies, that because water was on both sides of the Israelites they were immersed. There is as much of a figure in the language of the apostle, as if an individual were to pass between two hogsheads filled with water, and then say he is immersed. But permit me to remark, that in this eventful period there was an immersion, the first instance recorded in the Bible—an immersion not figurative, but real, genuine. Moses says in Ex. 15th chap. 10th verse, "The sea covered them (the Egyptians:) they *sank like lead* in the mighty waters." Or as the poet expresses it:

"The Lord hath but spoken
And chariot and horsemen *are sunk* in the wave."

e. In the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, 9th chapter, 10th verse, we have the following language: "Which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings," (diaphorois baptismois) literally translated different baptisms. Now if we refer to the Old Testament where these different baptisms, or as it is rendered, divers washings are described, we evidently see that they were performed not by immersion, but by sprinkling and pouring. Moses says, in Num. 19th chap. 18th verse: "And a clean person shall take a hyssop and dip it in water, and *sprinkle it* upon the tent and upon the vessels, and upon the *persons* that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain or one dead, or a grave," &c. Similar language you will find in Lev. 14th chap. 7th verse; Num. 8th chapter, 7th verse. All which specify that these washings, or baptisms, were performed by sprinkling and pouring. No mention is made at all of immersing under water.

f. In Mark, 7th chap. 3rd verse, the word baptizo cannot mean to immerse, but must necessarily mean, to wash; the following is the language of scripture. "And when they come from market, except they wash (baptize) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (baptisms) of cups and pots and brazen vessels and tables." As it respects cups and pots and brazen vessels, they might easily be immersed in water, but to suppose that tables

or couches would be taken out of the house, carried to some river, creek, pond or pool and be immersed under water, appears too unreasonable and inconsistent. But it appears reasonable and consistent to apply water to them either by pouring, sprinkling or washing. In intimate connection with this example is the instance of our Saviour, as recorded in Luke 11th chap. 37th and 38th verses, who had received an invitation from a Pharisee to dine with him, who when he sat at meat, marvelled because the Saviour "had not first washed (baptized) before dinner." The wonder on the part of the Pharisee was evidently because our Lord had not first *washed his hands* before dinner. To say, that he (Christ) had not first *immersed* before dinner would have been contrary to the custom of the Pharisees, for we are expressly told that, "the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft (or with the fist) eat not." In a word, TO IMMERSE AND IMMERSION ARE EXPRESSIONS WHICH DO NOT OCCUR, AT ALL, IN THE BIBLE.

From these considerations, we pass on to examine some of the examples recorded in the New Testament, where the rite of baptism was actually performed. As it respects the baptism performed by John, we have the clearest evidence that it was not christian baptism.

a. It was called by the apostle Paul, *John's baptism*, Acts, 19th chap. 5th verse, in contradistinction to christian baptism. b. It was the

introduction of Christ in his official character, as he says himself, John, 1st chap. 31st verse, "I knew him not, but *that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore I am come baptizing with water.*" *c.* It was not instituted by Christ. *d.* He did not baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Our text expressly declares that christian baptism had to be thus performed. *e.* We are expressly told in the Acts the 19th chapter, 5th verse, that those of John's baptism, who believed in Christ were baptized again; "when they heard this, *they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.*" Now if John's baptism had been a christian baptism, why were they baptized again? What evidence can be clearer than this, that his baptism was not christian baptism. *f.* The multitude which he baptized did not follow Christ. Could they have received a christian baptism? could they have been brought into his church by the very rite appointed for that object and yet reject him and even join in the general shout at his trial, "crucify him, crucify him?" Does christian baptism exert no happier influence on the minds of adults than that which they manifested towards Christ? Will not every rational man say, the baptism with which they were baptized, was not christian baptism? *g.* No, brethren, christian baptism was not established until within three years after that time; when it was established by Christ himself: when he uttered the words of the text,

“Go ye and make disciples of all *baptizing*,” &c. Then and *not till then* was this ordinance established, which was hereafter to be the initiatory rite of admission into his church upon earth. This is the general view of this subject by the ablest of divines. Among which number is the late Robert Hall, an eminent clergyman of the Baptist church in England.

Admitting, therefore, that John’s baptism was not a christian baptism, then his baptism affords no true criterion to decide the precise mode of baptism. But notwithstanding this, our Baptist Brethren place great reliance upon his baptism. We will select that interesting instance, when our Saviour was baptized by him, and see whether it favors immersion.

Before entering upon an examination of the mode of Christ’s baptism, let it be remarked, that if our Saviour had been inducted into the Priestly office by immersion, then his induction into that office would have been contrary to God’s own appointed way. We have in Ex. 29th chap. 21st verse, the following explicit language: “And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and *sprinkle* it upon Aaron,” &c. Aaron was the first High Priest. He was an eminent type of Christ. Now in accordance with the above manner of induction into the Priestly office, established by God himself and continued by Him during the old dispensation, you evidently perceive that Christ’s induction could not consistently have been performed by immersion,

but by *sprinkling*. And if God permitted John to induct Christ into his Priestly office by *immersion*, then it implies that the mode of induction, by Him, was not regarded essential, but immaterial. And if God recorded the mode of Christ's baptism immaterial, then by parity of reasoning, He will not regard the mode of our baptism essential, but likewise *immaterial*.

We are told in Matthew, 3rd chapter, 16th verse, that "Jesus when he was baptized, went up straitway out of the water." Although at first view, it appears this passage asserts that Jesus had been actually in the Jordan, but however there is no evidence that he either went under the water or that he came up out of the water. Immersion means going under the water, but this passage does not say so. Without doing violence to language, it can be rendered,* *he went up straitway away from the water*. The little word that is rendered *out of* is rendered in other places *from*, five times oftener than *out of*. And the word that is rendered *in* or *into* is frequently rendered *at*, *to*. This every Greek scholar acknowledges. Instead of saying therefore, *in the Jordan*, it can be rendered *at or to the Jordan*. There is an instance recorded in 2nd Kings, 6th chap. 4th verse, where this expression occurs, speaking of the sons of the prophets, they "*came to the Jordan to cut wood*." It would be inconsistent to say, that they went *into* the Jordan to cut wood.

*Robinson.

From these considerations it appears evident that Christ was not immersed by John, but that water was sprinkled upon him in accordance with God's own appointed way of the dedication of High Priests to that sacred office.

The same remarks are applicable in the case of the Eunuch, Acts, 8th chap. 38th and 39th verses. "They went down (the Eunuch and Philip,) both into the water, and he baptized him." The little word, *into*, can, agreeably to the above, be rendered, *to*, and then it would read, "They went down both *to* the water," &c. Here then, you perceive, that these little words do not certainly prove anything more than that they went *to* the water, and when they were come *from* the water. But even if it were certain that they went *into* the water, this would not determine the *mode* in which the water was used. If it be insisted upon, that the Eunuch was *actually* immersed, then it proves too much. For nothing is said of the Eunuch, that is not said of Philip. "They went down *both* into the water, and when they were *come up out* of the water." If the Eunuch was *actually* immersed, then Philip was in like manner *immersed*. And if Philip was not immersed, then there is no evidence that the Eunuch was *actually* immersed. On the principle of correct reasoning, this cannot be contradicted. In a word, they might have gone to the water edge, and there Philip baptized him, either by pouring or sprinkling water on him.

There are other circumstances, which must be taken into account, which do not favor immersion. As it respects the baptism of John, it is said by the Evangelist Matthew, 3d chap. 5th and 6th verses, "There went out to him Jerusalem, and *all* Judea and the regions round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan,* confessing their sins." Upon good authority, it has been estimated, that in the days of David, the population of Palestine could not have been less than six millions and seven hundred thousand, and in the time of John, it amounted to about six millions, and of these, one would suppose, judging from the language of Matthew, at least three millions must have been baptized by John.

Again, John the Baptist was six months older than Jesus Christ. He then must have entered upon his ministry about six months earlier than Christ did upon his. John continued but a few months after he had baptized Christ; consequently, his ministry must have been a year or less than a year. Now the question arises, how could John baptize such an immense multitude in such a short space of time by immersion? Admit for a moment, that he did baptize nine months—that his bodily strength would allow him to be in the water twelve

*If Jerusalem and *all* Judea, &c., went out to be baptized of John, then children in like manner were baptized. Children constitute a great portion of every community, and they must evidently be included in the number, since the expression *all* is used by the sacred penman in his narrative.

hours each day, both in summer and in winter, then he would have baptized rising of eleven thousand a day, rising of nine hundred an hour, and about fifteen each minute. Now is it possible that he could have baptized all these by immersion? Let reason and candor decide this matter. But he could easily have baptized them either by pouring or sprinkling.

Again, look at the case of the Eunuch. He was returning from Jerusalem. He, riding in his chariot, was engaged in reading in the prophecy of Isaiah, where a description is given of the humiliation of Christ. In which portion of scripture, this passage occurs, "*So shall he (Christ,) sprinkle many nations.*" The prophet had been speaking of the kingdom of Christ in the world, and here declares how different nations of which he was one should be introduced into that kingdom. He here says that it shall be done by sprinkling, as the initiatory rite. And if it was to be done by sprinkling, then certainly the Eunuch would not have been willing to be immersed since it was not only contrary to the prophet's declaration, but contrary also to Christ's mode as stated above. This promise had its accomplishment, when Christ sent his apostles to make disciples of all nations, by baptizing, &c. Now from the circumstance that the Eunuch had been reading of sprinkling, as being the initiatory rite for the admission into the kingdom of Christ, it appears evident that Philip must have sprinkled him.

The instance recorded in John, 3rd chapter, 23rd verse, that John baptized in Aenon because there was much water there, does not determine the manner of his baptism, because we read that he baptized also at Bethabara and in the wilderness where there is no express mention made that there was any water; although there was no doubt sufficient for the ordinary purposes of life. And if John's particular object in going to Aenon carries the idea that he went there *expressly* to immerse his subjects under water, then it appears evident that his former mode of baptizing had not been by immersion, but performed in some other way, because there was not a sufficient quantity of water for that purpose at the former place. And if he actually did immerse his subjects under water at Aenon, but did baptize them at the other places in some other manner, then the conclusion is that the use of water in the administration of the rite of baptism in the view of John himself was *immaterial*. And if immaterial, then consequently, there is nothing favorable to *immersion alone* as constituting christian baptism.

Again, I would ask why did the women, spoken of in Acts, 16th chap. 13th verse, go to "*the river-side*, where prayer was wont to be made?" It evidently could not have been for the object of baptizing, No, for that sacred right had not been known among them until the apostle came there and preached. That place was selected for its pleasant location, its beau-

tiful scenery and convenience. So John must have selected Aenon—a place of *convenience*, having an abundance of water for the accommodation of the multitude that came to his baptism. No inference whatever can therefore be drawn from this circumstance in favor of immersion.

Finally, in relation to the baptism performed by John, he says himself in Matt. 3rd chapter, 11th verse, “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he *shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*” Now if the word baptizo always means to immerse, does it, according to good sense, appear proper to say, *immersed in the Holy Ghost and immersed in fire?* Is not the Holy Ghost invariably represented as coming from above, as being poured out? Now if the word baptizo always means to immerse, then this prediction of John has not yet been fulfilled. But we have every reason to believe that it was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, Acts, 2nd chapter, when “*there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it (the sound) filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them, cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost,*” &c. This baptism of the Holy Spirit was in accordance with the promise of God made to the prophet Joel, 2nd chap. 28th and 29th verses. The apostle

Peter, in explaining to the Jews the above extraordinary event, says in the 16th and 17th verses: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, *I will pour out (ekcheo, to pour forth) my spirit upon all flesh,*" &c. Here then you have another evidence that this baptism of the Holy Spirit was not effected by immersion, but by being poured out upon the subjects thus baptized. Now taking this instance in connection with the one in Acts, 1st chap. 5th verse, explained on page 52, you evidently see that the mode of the baptism with the Holy Ghost was not effected by immersion, but by pouring or sprinkling, and if it was thus performed, then we may safely conclude that the baptism *with water* was in a similar manner performed.

The baptism of the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost, Acts, 2nd chapter, was performed at Jerusalem, where there was no river or creek—when it was summer, and the rains were scarce, the brook Kedron was dry, and no water was near except the pool of Siloam. Where could the apostles have found water in sufficient quantity to immerse the three thousand? We do not read that they went in search of water. Besides, when we consider all the circumstances in respect to the time required in preaching, in examining the converts, in preparing dresses; and then consider that each apostle had but a few hours left to immerse two hundred and fifty; is it not more

reasonable to believe that they were baptized by sprinkling, in accordance to the Jewish custom, which could have been done in a short time?

Again, does not this appear to have been the manner, when we look at the prophecy in Isaiah, 5th chap. 2d verse, where it is declared that, "*he (Christ,) shall sprinkle many nations.*" Now if we look to the day of Pentecost, which occurred a few days after Christ's ascension, many nations were present to hear the apostles. Not less than nineteen or twenty different nations were there present by representation, and three thousand of these representatives were at once introduced into the christian church. Here then, on the day of Pentecost, there appears to have been a commencement of the fulfilment of that prophecy. And you perceive that their introduction into the church, was not by immersion, but by sprinkling.

Again, while speaking of the prophecies, we have a description in Ezek. 36th chap. 25th verse, of the conversion of the Jews, their separation from among the heathen, and their return again to their own land. The question arises, how will this be effected? *In what manner will the initiatory rite of baptism be administered to them?* Let the prophet Ezekiel answer this question: "*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you.*" Showing evidently, that the initiatory rite of their admission into the church of Christ will be not by immersion, but by sprinkling.

The case of the jailor in Acts, 16th chap., being baptized in the jail, does not favor immersion. There is no mention made, that he and the apostles, Paul and Silas, went out either to a stream or a pool of water. Besides, according to the Roman laws, it would have been death to the jailor to have left the jail for any purpose whatever with one of his prisoners. The apostles were his prisoners. It was at midnight when he was baptized. The city was in agitation in consequence of the earthquake, how would he have dared to go out with his prisoners. Besides, the apostles on the following day, would not leave even the jail without permission of the ruling authorities. All these circumstances do not favor immersion, but rather that he was baptized in some other manner. He evidently was baptized immediately after his conversion in the principal room of the jail.

In the Acts of the Apostles, the 9th chapter, 18th verse, an account is given of the baptism of Paul. "He arose and was baptized." If it read, he arose and went out to be baptized, then it might favor immersion, but it simply says: "he arose and was baptized." No man laying claim to any scholarship in the Greek language would hazard his reputation by contending that the Greek word translated *arose*, signifies any thing more than *to stand up—to arise as from a bed*. It implies no motion forward. Paul had been in a house—was very weak in consequence of not having taken any

food for three days. He evidently just stood up and was in that position baptized, which could not have been done by immersion, but must have been done in some other manner. Let me present another instance, in which there can be no doubt but that water was applied *to the subject*. In Acts the 18th chap. 47 verse, we have an account given of the conversion of Cornelius, his family and friends. Peter says, "Can any man forbid water, that these should be baptized." This is just such language as I would employ to baptize by pouring or sprinkling. But a Baptist clergyman would have to change the expression, in order to be correctly understood. The appropriate language for such a one to use, would be, "Can any man forbid us *to go to the water* that these should be immersed?" This example clearly points out, that they were not immersed, but that water was applied in some other manner.

From the foregoing examples and illustrations we can safely draw the following conclusion, that the Greek word, baptizo, which expresses the rite of baptism, does not necessarily mean to immerse, but means the application of water in other ways to the person baptized. Again, it cannot be proved from an examination of any, or all the passages in the Bible, that an entire immersion was ever connected with the word, or that in a single instance of it ever occurred. The apostles were accustomed to baptize whenever and wherever an occasion required them to administer this ordinance.

Whether they were in prison, on a journey, in a sick room, or wherever proper subjects presented themselves, *there* they baptized them. We do nowhere read in the Bible that they ever went out expressly to a river or pond in order to immerse their subjects. If the persons baptized, went into the water, still there is no positive evidence, that they were immersed. And without a positive precept, no man is under obligation to be immersed under water, unless he feels willing or desirous that his baptism shall be performed in that manner.

But notwithstanding this clear representation that the word baptizo means the application of water in different other modes than immersion, yet our Baptist Brethren are unwilling to yield the point in debate. They adhere to exclusive immersion as the only valid mode of baptism, like as a drowning man clings to a straw to save him from a watery grave. They lay great stress on the figurative language of the apostle Paul as recorded in Rom. 6th chap. 4th verse, as favoring the mode of immersion alone. The following is the language of the apostle, "Therefore we are buried with him by *baptism* into death; that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In order to satisfy the mind of an unprejudiced person as to the real object of the apostle in this passage, we need only quote the next verses which are connected with the former one. The apostle continues, "For if we have been *planted* together,

(still by baptism) in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is *crucified* (still by baptism) with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that hereafter we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." Now if *being buried with him by baptism* implies that Christ was actually immersed under water, when he was baptized, then the question arises, what resemblance is there between his baptism by immersion, and our being *planted with him*? None whatever.

Again, as the apostle in the same connection, speaks of our being *crucified* with Christ and that by baptism; what resemblance can there be between *immersion in water and the nailing of a body to a cross*?

Again I reply, none whatever. Had the apostle said that "we are buried *under water* in our baptism," or had Christ died by *being drowned*, then there might be some resemblance, but since he died on the cross there can be no possible resemblance. For to immerse signifies *the sinking down* of the body under water, but to crucify signifies *the raising up the body and nailing it to a cross*. The position of the body in both respects is directly the reverse of each other. Admitting for a moment that there is a resemblance between Christ's death and his baptism, (by immersion) then it would imply that immersion is not the only mode, but *only one of its modes*; for as we have already seen in the foregoing examples and illustrations,

that baptism was performed by pouring and sprinkling, besides we have clearly seen too that Christ's baptism could not have been by immersion, but either by pouring or sprinkling.

Again, the apostle in the above passage simply uses the words "being buried with him *by baptism*," where the nature of this ordinance is only mentioned without the least allusion to the mode. Rev. Mr. Robison, the Baptist historian, and Rev. Mr. Judson, the Baptist missionary, together with a great body of learned and pious divines "admit that this passage is misapplied when used as evidence of the mode of baptism."

The following appears to be the correct exposition of this passage: "Therefore as he, viz., Christ was naturally buried, so are we spiritually buried by that forgiveness of sins, which subjected us to a spiritual death. That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."* In a word, the baptism spoken of is spiritual and has not the least reference to any particular mode of the external rite. It means that believers in Christ are dead to sin, dead to all sinful affections, pursuits and actions; or as it is expressed by the apostle Paul, "I am crucified with Christ, being made conformable unto his death, dead indeed unto sin, but alive to God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

*President Beecher.

Again, there is another passage urged with much confidence as favoring immersion, to be the only valid mode. It is in Eph. 4th chap. 5th verse: "One Lord, one faith, *one baptism.*" It is contended that baptism administered by water is here meant, and since there is but one baptism, there can be but one mode of administering the rite. Allowing that water baptism is here meant, yet nothing is favorable to any particular mode of using the water in this ordinance. Its *oneness* does not consist in the mode, but in the *design* and *the object* of it, administered by a suitable person in the name of the trinity and by the use of water. Analogous to this is the Lord's Supper—one simple ordinance, designed to commemorate the dying love of Christ. Its *oneness* does not consist in the manner *where* received or *how* received; whether in an upper room or in the church—whether the partakers receive it sitting, standing, kneeling or lying on a bed—whether on the Lord's day or in the week—whether at evening, noon or morning. These attending circumstances do not effect the *oneness* of this ordinance. Now to reason in a similar manner, why should the mode of the use of water in baptism effect its *oneness*?

But the objector still returns and says, "*but Christ went in the Jordan, and all true disciples must follow him there?*" To which I reply, admit it, that Christ went in the Jordan, he has not told us that we should follow him there. There is not a passage in the Bible, that says,

that we must go in the Jordan to be baptized, or in other words, that we must be baptized by *immersion alone*. All the water in the Jordan in and of itself cannot cleanse the heart of any man. Christ said to Nicodemus, John 3rd chapter, "Except a man be born of water and *the Holy Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

But the objector says, "*we must follow the footsteps of Christ in every particular.*" To which I reply. Let us pass by his washing the disciples' feet, which the objector does not do—let us pass by his many other acts of kindness and love, which the objector does not manifest—let me direct your attention to the time and the circumstances, when Christ first instituted the Lord's Supper. It was on Thursday instead of Sunday. It was in the evening instead of the day time—it was in an upper room instead of the church, unleavened bread was used instead of the finest leavened wheat-bread. He did neither sit, stand, nor kneel, but *reclined* on his elbow. It was a full meal—an evening supper, instead of a small piece of bread. No females were present, none but his disciples together with Judas. There and under these circumstances, Christ celebrated the Lord's Supper. Now if the objector insists that we must follow the footsteps of Christ in every particular, then the Lord's Supper must be celebrated at just such a place—with just so many present, together with a *Judas*.

Again, I would ask the question, if a small piece of bread, and that leavened, answers the same purpose in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, that a full meal does, *why will not a small quantity of water answer the like purpose for the rite of baptism that a whole fountain does?* Permit me to tell you that the Greek word, which is translated *supper*, does not mean a small particle of bread, but a full meal—an evening supper. Now then it appears consistent that if a small piece of bread answers the same purpose in the administration of the Lord's Supper, then by parity of reasoning, a small quantity of water will answer the same purpose in the administration of the ordinance of baptism.

Again, if immersion was the only scriptural mode in the ordinance of baptism, *why then does the Lord bless the labors of those ministers and churches who administer this rite of baptism in any mode?* When we look at the catalogue of the annual increase of the number of the members in these Evangelical churches, who do not baptize by immersion only, who will deny that *they are not blessed of the Lord?* Not only are they increasing annually in number, but in piety and in closer union with God—in more holy fellowship with each other, and in unity of action for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom upon the earth. Now if God does so richly bless them and their labors of love, can they be out of the church of Christ, because they cannot believe and prac-

tise *believer's baptism only*? No, brethren. We have abundant reason to adopt the language of the apostle Paul, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

God, in the plenitude of his goodness, blesses all Evangelical churches. His grace is not withheld because the modes of administering the ordinance of baptism, in different branches of his church are not alike; should we then, the recipients of his grace, make any distinction? Should we then withhold the right hand of christian fellowship from those whom he has accepted and adopted in his own family to be his beloved children, because they cannot believe *in believer's baptism only*? Has Christ our great pattern and exemplar not taught us to pray "thy will be done on earth, even as it is done in heaven," how then can we be Christ's, if we refuse and reject those who are his by adoption—belong to his visible church—experience his rich grace and give all the evidences of genuine christianity? Brethren, I have heard the religious experience of many—I have read of the religious experience and happy deaths of many, but I have not yet heard or read of one, who regretted, even at death's door, that he had not been immersed under water in the ordinance of his baptism.

Again, although ministers of other denominations have left their respective organizations and united with those of exclusive immersion and communion, yet ministers belonging to them, have likewise left them and united with

other denominations. From good authority, I can mention the names of some of the most distinguished ministers in the christian church, that have changed their views on exclusive immersion and communion. I can mention the names of Janeway, Skinner, Smith, Howe, Lane, Spencer, two by the name of Dodge, Snow, Ogelby, Chapin, Potter, Allen, Wilson, John Wayland and others, men distinguished for talent, learning, piety and usefulness. One Edwards has written an able tract on the subject, styled, "*Short way with the Baptists.*"

In addition to those who have changed their views on the subject of exclusive immersion, we have authentic accounts that hundreds of ministers and hundreds of churches of the Anabaptists in Europe, have adopted pouring instead of immersion. They found by sad experience that candidates for baptism when lying on sick beds or having infirmities, could not be immersed under water; they have therefore deliberately given up immersion and substituted pouring or sprinkling. And the work of change is still in progress among them, and the prospects are that before long many more, if not all will give up immersion and adopt the common mode of baptizing by pouring or sprinkling.

Again, not only is a change of view in progress among the Anabaptists, but a change is going on among the Baptists in England, on the subject of close communion, or close baptism as it is called, which change is *not unfavorable*

to sprinkling. In a letter that appeared in many of the religious papers of this country during the previous year, we learn that there is a great tendency among the Baptists in England, towards *a closer union with their christian brethren* of other denominations. It appears that there is a committee, called "the Central Committee of Particular Baptists in England, maintaining strict communion to the Baptists of America." This committee was appointed in April 1841, to arrest as it is said, the progress of open communion, which they lament as wrong and as tending to subvert their very existence as a denomination. They intreat the aid of their American brethren and state their emergency in the following terms. "We believe that there is still a considerable majority of strict communion churches in our denomination, but in not a few of these, the *pastor*, and therefore, perhaps an increasing proportion of members are in favor of an *open* communion; so that it is probable that the number of strict churches will continue to decrease; and this probability is strengthened by the fact, that most of the *tutors of our colleges*, and of the students under their care, are also in favor of *open communion*."

In connection with the above change in the views of the advocates of exclusive immersion and communion, permit me to remark that upon an examination of administering the ordinance of baptism, as recorded in church history, no particular mode was held essential, until we

come down to the year 1522, when the Anabaptists arose in Germany. But as we have already seen, a great portion of them have changed their views in favor of pouring. From that period to the present, there has been in some portion of the Protestant church an unhappy division on this subject. Our respected Baptist Brethren do consider immersion alone *essential* to christian baptism. The Greek church as we have already shown, practise both immersion and affusion, but neither are regarded *essential*. The Roman Catholic church practises pouring and sprinkling. She has always done so, since her very origin. In a word, although there are individual members in all those respective churches, who may regard immersion as more expressive of the rite of baptism and do perhaps immerse, but yet do not consider it the only *essential* mode. Such for example, were the views of Dr. Campbell, of Edinburg. But still he did not maintain it to be the only mode, but that others were equally valid.

Thus, then, we have seen that the Greek word, baptizo, does in no case, signify exclusive immersion, but the application of water in any manner to the subject. We have seen that there is no specific mode pointed out by the Great Head of the church, so as to constitute it the only *essential* one. We have seen too that as such it is now regarded, with the exception of our Baptist Brethren, and has

been so understood generally, in the christian church in all ages.

To conclude. The first inference from this subject is, that to consider *immersion alone, as the essential mode*, is investing that mode with a sacredness which will exert an unhappy tendency in the minds of our Baptist Brethren. This principle is clearly manifested in the case of a sect, called Campbellites, who have seceded from the Baptist church. They have, unhappily, been the means of rending asunder many a flourishing congregation of that denomination. They are very numerous in the southern and western states. They place an undue attachment to immersion under water as being the only mode of baptism. Nay, they consider it a saving ordinance. Mr. Campbell their leader has declared "that immersion is so significant and so expressive, that when the baptized believer rises out of the water—enters the world a second time—he enters it as innocent—as clean—as unspotted as an angel." Our Baptist Brethren, lay, in like manner, too great a stress upon immersion. And although they do not say, in so many words, that it is a saving ordinance, yet they carry out this principle by their close communion, that they alone have a christian baptism, and therefore, are *alone* the true followers of the Lord. They regard themselves as possessing *alone* the promise of the gospel, and are *alone* entitled to the blessings of the Lord. While they regard other denominations of christians as virtually

not belonging to the christian church, but as living and acting in violation of the commands of God, and if saved, cannot be saved in God's appointed way, but by his uncovenanted mercies.

Again, by laying so great a stress upon the particular mode, our Baptist Brethren have injured themselves. In the energetic language of President Beecher, "It has injured them. Among them are eminently pious men, but a bad system has ensnared and betrayed them. How else can we account for it that they should have dared solemnly and formally to arrogate to themselves that they are divinely and peculiarly set for the defense of the gospel, and that the heathen world must look to them alone for an unveiled view of the glories of the gospel of Christ. Has it come to this? Take away immersion, and is the gospel shorn of all its glories? Yea, is the gospel itself annihilated? Is immersion the gospel? What more can the most bigotted defender of baptismal regeneration and sacramental sanctification say than all this? But do our pious Baptist Brethren mean all this? No! a thousand times, No. They know and feel, as well as we, that immersion is not the gospel. These facts only show, what all experience has shown, the danger of holding a system which makes a mere form of so much moment in practice as to outweigh holiness of heart and of life."

Placing so much dependence upon a particular mode, a narrowness of feeling and an un-

charitable and even an unchristian spirit has been generated in the hearts of our Baptist Brethren. Their system has had a tendency to exalt themselves in their own estimation—to regard themselves as the only true depositories of gospel truths and gospel ordinances in this world. This unhappy spirit has particularly been manifested in relation to the *American*, and to the *British and Foreign Bible Societies*; those two noble and christian institutions; institutions, which are sustained by the tears, the prayers and the liberalities of millions of professing christians of different denominations, who can lay aside their sectarian peculiarities and unite on one common basis to disseminate the word of life throughout the world, but our Baptist Brethren arrogate to themselves a peculiar divine appointment to propagate their own sectarian principles—to define the peculiar mode of the christian ordinance of baptism, which the Holy Ghost has not defined, and thus charge those two great national societies “as virtually combining to obscure a part at least of divine revelation,” and say that “the real meaning of words used in connection with one of Christ’s ordinances is *purposely kept out of sight*.”* Such serious charges—such a vain bigotted spirit manifested on their part towards those societies, to which belong men certainly as holy—as sincere—as learned and as defenders for gospel truths and gospel ordinances as

*See the Report of their Bible Society, 1840, p. 39.

themselves; such a spirit, I say, does not correspond with the teachings of Christ—the promptings of the Holy Spirit—the first warm, generous impulses of the christian heart, but is the result of sectarian principles, and of a false, deluded and deluding system, which pervades the minds of the great body of our Baptist Brethren.

Again, not only is it injurious to themselves to lay too great a stress upon the particular mode of baptism, but it is injurious to the best interests of the whole community. The gospel of Christ infuses peace and charity in the hearts of its professed followers towards each other among all the christian denominations, but their system has a tendency directly the reverse. On all the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, christians of every name can unite in worshipping the God of heaven—labor to promote the best interest of Christ's kingdom upon earth—sing and pray together; should they then be placed in hostile array against each other on non-fundamentals—nay, on mere external rites and forms? The system of our Baptist Brethren does this. It makes non-fundamental principles apparently of more importance than fundamental doctrines. These principles unfortunately arm holy men against holy men—these alienate feelings disturb oftentimes the peace of whole christian communities—set near relations at variance—encourage infidelity and check the work of grace in hearts, desirous of gospel truths. The evils, resulting

from such a system, have been often manifested in times of revivals; when the public mind was absorbed in religious matters, and when souls were inquiring the way to Zion, then, often instead of pointing the serious enquirer to the Lamb of God as their only blessed hope of heaven, the subjects of "*immersion you must follow Christ in the Jordan,*" &c., formed the prominent topics of conversation and anxiety by our Baptist Brethren. If any of the serious in their own revivals happened to belong to families of other denominations, attempts were made, and that too often successful, in prejudicing their minds against their own ministers and people and doctrines and churches. Even children have had their minds thus unhappily wrought upon. Passages of scripture were given, which, instead of pointing the inquirer to Christ for salvation, apparently favored their own sectarian views—thus arming them, as was supposed, in warding off all the attempts, which their own ministers and friends might, in the discharge of their solemn duties, urge upon their minds as the one thing needful for peace and pardon. Such scenes have been witnessed with grief. And such scenes too have not been uncommon of late. The sad consequences naturally were unholy controversies on non-fundamental principles—the departure of the Holy Spirit—the check of the revival and the ruin of many precious souls. All this is wrong; radically wrong. Over which many christians have deeply mourned and fer-

vently prayed. Our most judicious Baptist Brethren have seen and felt too with us, the sad consequences, which their own system directly tends to promote. Brethren these things ought not so to be!!

But considering the mode of baptism as unessential, and performed, regarding the bodily constitution and the health of the candidate—the season of the year—the climate—the decency—the convenience and solemnity of the ordinance, no undue stress will be laid on any particular mode.* The great body of the

*Baptism performed by immersion, is not in accordance with that tender sense of decency and propriety which ought always to characterize females. Who has not often seen them, after being immersed, shrink as it were, by an inward sense of indelicate exposure from the gaze of the spectators? Neither is it calculated to solemnize the mind or retain that composed and devotional spirit, which affusion produces. Who has not often witnessed, in the female candidate when about to be immersed, the hurried breathing—the violent palpitation of the heart and her spasmodic grasp on the arm of the administrator? And when raised up out of the water has she not oftentimes strangled—manifested deep agitation and even a distress of soul? Besides, who will deny but that severe sicknesses—derangements and even deaths have not oftentimes been the sad consequences of their immersion?

Again, immersion is not fitted for universal practice throughout the world at all times and under all circumstances in life. Thousands of the Anabaptists, who once were strong advocates for immersion, have seen this and have thus wisely given it up. Passing by the sick bed—the infirm—the delicate in health and the lame, examine upon your map those portions of the world inhabited where water sufficient for immersion could only be found a hundred miles distant. Can immersion be conveniently practised in such countries? No. There are other portions, where, amidst mountains of ice and almost perpetual snow, it

christian church, though differing on various subjects, yet as it regards the mode of baptism, have no contention. They believe in the nature and importance of the ordinance,—they attend to its requirements as well as the respected denominations of christians, called Baptists. Nay, they in one word, are as good Baptists as those are, who are expressly designated by that name.

The second inference from this subject is, to consider immersion as the *only essential mode* in the ordinance of baptism, then there is *no christian church upon earth*. You have already been told that there was no denomination of christians, from the death of Christ, until the Anabaptists arose in Germany, in 1522, that considered any particular mode *essential*. And after them, the Calvinistic Baptist church in England, which commenced, as stated in the preceding discourse, September 12th, 1633.

must be highly imprudent, and if at all performed, it is *dangerous*. As an evidence of which, we are told by Captain Cochrane in his travels in the Northern Regions of Europe and Asia in 1820—1, the following: “After they had paraded a little, the priest baptized men and women, not by sprinkling them with water, but *obliging them to strip and plunge three times into a caldron of ice water*. The long hair of the women became surrounded by icicles.” A question arises here “does the gospel of Christ, require the indecency—the strugglings of soul—the opposite of all devotional feelings and the exposure of health, in the public profession of its candidates?” No. No. Immersion has manifested all these, but affusion *never*. Does not then affusion, in these respects, appear to be the most reasonable and proper?

Now the question arises, who baptized by immersion, those that constituted their first church? The clergyman's name was Spilsbury. Another question arises; had he been immersed by one of the same faith and order, who himself too, had been immersed? Ivimey, the author of the *History of the English Baptist*, vol. 1, p. 138, when speaking of their origin, says: "And as they believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, so they looked upon the baptism, which they had at that age as invalid, whereupon most of all received a new baptism, (by being immersed in water) on personal profession of repentance and faith." From which it appears, that those who were then immersed, were not so immersed by one, who had himself been immersed by one of the same faith and order, consequently to reason according to their own principles laid down, their baptism was invalid, because performed by one who had not truly himself been immersed.

Again, how did the Baptist church in America, take her origin? We are informed in Governor Winthrop's *Journal*, and by the Rev. Mr. Backus' *Church History of New England*, that the Rev. Roger Williams was the founder of the Baptist church in America, in the year 1639. He having been a minister of a Pedobaptist church in Salem, Mass., from thence he was banished for some civil affair. He fled to Providence, Rhode Island, together with eleven of his people. There they embraced

Baptist views and organized a church. But how did they do it? The following is the account given: "One Ezekiel Holyman, who was a layman, and who had been baptized in infancy, and by sprinkling, and consequently had never been baptized according to the views of the Baptists, took Mr. Williams and baptized him by immersion, or rather went through the ceremony of baptizing him; and then Mr. Williams, who upon the principles of the Baptists, had never been baptized, re-baptized Mr. Holyman, the very individual, who had just before gone through the ceremony of baptizing him, and also the ten others who fled from Massachusetts bay." Now, upon the principle of our Baptist Brethren, none of these were actually baptized, and consequently no Baptist church was ever established. The baptism which Roger Williams received, having been performed only by a layman. Thus, by attempting to unchurch all those denominations, which have not been immersed by one, who had himself been immersed, professing the same faith and order, they actually unchurch themselves. Nay, to follow out their own principles of reasoning, there is actually no valid baptism, and consequently, no christian church upon earth.

Such was the conclusion to which Roger Williams himself arrived; for it is said that after preaching for several months as a Baptist minister, "he then separated himself from them, doubting the validity of all baptisms,

because *a direct succession could not be traced from the apostles to the officiating ministers.*"

But blessed be God, we are not placed in this unhappy condition. I believe that Christ has a church upon earth, built upon a foundation so firm, that all the combined powers of earth and hell, cannot prevail against her; a church nurtured, sustained and blessed by himself as her king and protector. Of which church, all Evangelical denominations constitute a part, and hence all ought to be knit together in the tenderest bonds of affection, aid each other in opposing sin in every form, and labor together for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom upon the earth.

Another inference, resulting from considering immersion *alone essential*, is, that it leads to the practice of *close communion*. It is not uncommon with our Baptist Brethren in a time of deep seriousness to tell the young convert, "unite with us and you will be sure to be right; if the way in which water is applied is not essential, you will be right; but if it essential you will be right. At all events by uniting with us you will be more in the right than by uniting with any other denomination." Immersion is thus prominently held up before the mind of the young convert as all important in making a profession of his faith, while however the principle of *close communion* is left in the shade. Many serious inquirers after truth have thus been deceived. They have ignorantly subscribed to a principle, which is

revolting to every christian feeling; which, with the sharp knife of excision, cuts asunder the bonds and fellowship of christians, who ought to be *one* in Christ. But the question arises, what is close communion? It is communion at the table of the Lord, confined and restricted to a single denomination; all others, however sound in faith, however devoted to God, however satisfactory the evidence of their christian experience, yet are debarred from partaking with them at this feast of love! Though they will unite with others in worshipping God at the same altar—sing together the same songs of Zion—unite in prayer, and even their ministers will acknowledge the ministers of other denominations, pray for them, call them brothers in the Lord, exchange pulpits with them, yet when their own communion-table is spread, those ministers are not invited, and even should they approach, they would be debarred from that great blessing and told, “*we cannot fellowship you because you have not been immersed.*”

It was in view of this, that that eminent servant of God, the late Rev. Robert Hall, himself a Baptist, opposed close communion, called it “*party communion,*” but advocated open communion, and it is upon the same principle that such a large and respectable portion of the Baptist church in England have come out in favor of open communion. And I have been informed, upon good authority, that the cause of open communion is beginning to develope

itself more and more among our Baptist Brethren in this country.

In consequence of close communion, many a heart has bled, many a tear has been shed, many a struggle of soul has been endured, many relations and kindred of the deepest piety living together—others meeting, after years of separation, in a christian church at the time of communion have been denied this heavenly privilege of uniting together in this christian ordinance. Is this genuine Christianity? Is this the Spirit of the great Master of the feast? Is this manifesting brotherly love? Is it setting such an example before the world, so as to constrain the people of the world to exclaim in the language of the heathens of old, “see how these brethren love each other?” Is this following out the injunctions of Christ, when speaking of brotherly love, “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, *if ye love one another*; as I have loved you, ye *ought also to love one another*?” The apostle John, whose very soul was filled with love, says, “By this we know that we have passed from death unto life, *because we love the brethren.*” Is it brotherly love to debar each other from the table of the Lord, to deny to them the greatest and the most heavenly of all earthly blessings? Who can read the farewell prayer of Christ, in John 17th chap., and not have his very soul moved with love to him, and to our fellow christians? Christ had before him his disciples, to whom he had administered

the christian Passover, although they had not been baptized but had only been circumcised, and yet he did not debar them from the gracious privilege, but administered it to them with his own hands, and shall we be wiser and more holy than he was? He, at the eve of crucifixion, prayed that all christians might be united, be one, one in common faith, one in spirit, one in purpose and action, one in love, and one in the celebration of the ordinances established in his church for their own spiritual good.

I will conclude this subject in the language of an eloquent writer:* “Free communion,” says he, “should be practised because the church on earth ought to become, as far as possible, *like* the church in heaven. With the church in heaven, where all cast their crowns at the feet of the Lamb and sing, ‘Hallelujah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; blessing and honor, glory and power be unto Him that sitteth on the throne forever and ever;’ *there close communion finds no countenance.* There one Master presides, one table is spread, one spirit reigns, one practice prevails. There all who have been baptized into one body, by one spirit, and washed in that one fountain opened for the house of David, and are of one heart, and one mind, dwell together in perfect unity. There free communion of heart with heart, and soul with soul, pervades the unnumbered, holy, glorious throng. The church on earth

*Rev. Orin Fowler.

ought to bear a strong likeness to the church in heaven. As there is but one table above, there should be but one below. As perfect love binds all hearts to God and each other there, so love unrestricted should bind all hearts together here. All who have drunk at the same fountain, are enlisted under the same banner, and will finally dwell in the same kingdom, sing the same song, and rejoice forever in the glories of the same Redeemer; are bound to make the church militant as far as possible, like the church triumphant, and thus urge forward the chariot wheels of the Prince of life; and this never can be done, unless free, unrestricted communion of visible believers, who are agreed in the fundamental truths of the gospel, be universally practiced.”
Amen.



GENERAL INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

INFANT BAPTISM.

	<i>Pages.</i>
Text and Introduction, - - - - -	5—6
Church of God under both dispensations, -	6—9
Infant membership under the old dispensation, -	9—15
Infant membership under the new family baptisms,	15—17
Initiation of infants under both dispensations,	17—20

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Baptism is a spiritual ordinance, circumcision is not,	21—23
Circumcision was applied to males only, -	23—24
Believeth and is baptized, - - - - -	24—26
What benefit can it be, - - - - -	26—28
If one of the parents only is a member, - -	28—29
Why prevent children from coming to the table of the Lord, - - - - -	29
Was not the Lord's Supper administered to chil- dren, - - - - -	29—30
There is no instance in the New Testament of in- fant baptism—family baptisms, - - -	30—31
A striking example of infant baptism in the New Testament, - - - - -	31—33
Children not to be baptized because Jesus Christ was not until 30 years of age, - - -	33
Why was Jesus Christ baptized by John, - -	33—35
Where is the express command, - - - -	35—37

HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS.

Dr. Miller—Justin Martyr—Ireaneus—Tertullian— Origin—Council of Bishops—Augustine—Pela- gius, - - - - -	37—40
Opposition to infant baptism—Ivimey, - -	40—41
The church from the Reformation—Greek church— Roman Catholic church, - - - - -	41—43
Concluding remarks, - - - - -	43—44

MODE OF BAPTISM.

	<i>Pages.</i>
In what mode is water to be used to constitute scriptural baptism—Luther, - - -	45—46
The Greek word bapto and baptizo—Carson—Dr. Miller—Luther's Translation—Stuart—Greek church—Dr. Kurtz, - - - - -	46—49
The classic Greek of the Old Testament—Ecclesiasticus, 34th chapter, 25th verse—Lev. 14th chap. 6th verse—Daniel, 4th chap. 33rd verse,	49—50
The Greek of the New Testament—Matthew, 3rd chap. 16th verse—John, 1st chap. 31st verse—Acts, 1st chap. 5th verse, 11th chap. 15th and 16th verses, - - - - -	51—52
1 Cor. 10th chapter, 1st and 2nd verses—Heb. 9th chap. 10th verse—Mark, 7th chap. 3rd verse—Luke, 11th chap. 37th and 38th verses, - -	52—55
John's baptism not christian baptism, - -	55—57
Christ's baptism—his induction into the Priestly office not by immersion, - - - - -	57—59
The Eunuch—Acts, 8th chap. 38th and 39th verses,	59
John's baptism not by immersion—Matt. 3rd chap. 16th verse—Matt. 3rd chap. 5th and 6th verses—John, 3rd chap, 23rd verse—Matt. 3rd chapter, 11th verse—Joel, 2nd chapter, 28th and 29th verses—Acts, 2nd chapter, - - - - -	60—64
The 3,000 at Pentecost—Acts, 2nd chapter, -	64—65
The return and conversion of the Jews—Ezekiel, 36th chap. 25th verse, - - - - -	65
The Jailor—Acts, 16th chapter, - - - - -	66
The apostle Paul—Acts, 9th chap. 18th verse,	66—67
Cornelius—Acts, 18th chap. 47th verse, -	67
The conclusion of the examination of the above passages of scripture and remarks, - -	67—68
Buried in baptism—Rom. 6th chap. 4th verse,	68—70
One baptism—Eph. 4th chap. 5th verse, -	71


OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.


Christ went in the Jordan—follow Christ in every particular—a small piece of bread at the communion—why does the Lord bless all denominations—ministers of other denominations unite with the Baptist and the reverse—the change of

	<i>Pages.</i>
views in Europe in relation to immersion and close communion—the Central Committee—Church History—Dr. Campbell, - - -	71—77

INFERENCES.


Immersion alone as the essential mode exerts an unhappy tendency on the minds of the Baptists—is injuring them—is injuring community,	78—84
Immersion alone as the essential mode, then there is no christian church upon earth. The history of the origin of the Baptist church in England—America—Roger Williams, - - -	84—87
On close communion, - - - - -	87—91




















Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01021 3975